UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,784	03/22/2007	Gert-Ake Olsson	47113-5023-00 (219687)	7412
55694 7590 04/19/2010 DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH (DC)			EXAMINER	
1500 K STREE		FRANCIS, FAYE		
SUITE 1100 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20005-1209		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3725	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/19/2010	ELECTRONIC

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DBRIPDocket@dbr.com penelope.mongelluzzo@dbr.com

		A 11 (/ )			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/560,784	OLSSON ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Faye Francis	3725			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONEI	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 L     This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ Thi     Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4)  Claim(s) 21 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-5 and 21 is/are wire  5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 7-20 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examina 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 December 2005 is a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objectored drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ction is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/22/07.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te			

Application/Control Number: 10/560,784 Page 2

Art Unit: 3725

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of group II in the reply filed on 3/23/10 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that each of the inventions of Group I, II and III, in some form, include same special technical features. This is not found persuasive because the examiner has shown a definite disconnect between the separate groups and has shown search burden in searching separate <u>classes</u> and subclasses. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

## Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means", "said," and "comprises" should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the use of legal phraseology [note the word **"comprises"** in line 1. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/560,784 Page 3

Art Unit: 3725

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. For example **only**, the phrase "a first fixing step" in line 6 of claims 6 and 12, render the claim indefinite because for example claim 6 is directed to an apparatus, i.e. "Outer shell" not to a method. In another example only, the phrase "be brought in engagement with a spacer member" is confusing. Has the spacer member been claimed or not?

Claim 6 is indefinite because the claim is vague as to whether it recites the combination of the outer shell and gyratory crusher or the subcombination of the outer shell only. This in turn is because the claim appears to recite further structural limitations on the gyratory crusher when no gyratory crusher appears to have been positively recited in this claim. The reference to the gyratory crusher in claim 6 appears to be only functional, i.e., claim 6 recites Outer shell **for** fixing in a gyratory crusher. Note claim 6 does not structurally require a gyratory crusher. Accordingly, the single limitation in claim 6 appears to be a further structural limitation on an element as feature that is not claimed, but only recited in claim 6 as an intended use of the claimed outer

Art Unit: 3725

shell. Should the applicant want to claim a gyratory crusher then the same should be clearly done.

Claim 7 is indefinite since all that the applicant considers to be encompassed by the phrases "the outer shell seen in a material flow direction" and "be brought in engagement with a spacer member" cannot be determined. These types of terminologies are repeated throughout the claims. Note also claim 12 in this regard.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the spacer member" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

With respect to claim 10: a broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 10 recites the broad recitation angle of 10-55 degree, and the claim also recites right angle, which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Application/Control Number: 10/560,784 Page 5

Art Unit: 3725

Claim 12 is indefinite because it is not clear what the phrase "a first fixing step" is intended to encompass. This type of terminology is repeated throughout the claims.

The applicant is requested to review all of the claims for the purpose of making corrections wherever appropriate but not specifically pointed to.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 7. Claims 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by GB 746,566, hereinafter GB'566.

The claims are interpreted as best understood by the examiner. The claims are interpreted as requiring a gyratory crusher including an outer shell 18 which is secured in a frame 10, an inner shell 22 which is secured on a crushing head 20 defining a crushing gap 42 for receipt of material to be crushed, wherein the outer shell of the crusher has a first and second abutment surfaces and a spacer 66. GB'566 is considered to clearly show a device having the structural elements of the claims that can be understood.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faye Francis whose telephone number is 571-272-4423. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 3725

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dana Ross can be reached on 571-272-4480. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Faye Francis/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3725

FF